DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 405 764 HE 030 002

TITLE The Workload of the UMS Faculty. A Report to the Joint Chairs of the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee and the House Appropriations Committee.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ. System Administration, Adelphi.
PUB DATE 1 Dec 95
NOTE 64p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Faculty Publishing; *Faculty Workload; Higher Education; *Productivity; Research; State Regulation; *Teaching Load; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS *University of Maryland System

ABSTRACT

This report provides the results of a study of faculty workloads in the University of Maryland System (UMS) during the 1994-95 academic year. It was found that 19,446 course units were taught by full-time (FT) faculty at degree-granting institutions, an increase of 158 course units from the previous year while the number of FT faculty decreased by 106. Of the 3,653 FT faculty at UMS institutions, 1,111 (30 percent) were granted exceptions from teaching the standard load. Thirty-four percent of FT faculty taught more than the standard load. Externally funded research accounted for 19 percent of course load exceptions, while sabbaticals accounted for 21 percent and departmental administration accounted for 20 percent. A total of $315 million was obtained by UMS institutions in externally funded research in 1994-95, and UMS faculty published 800 books, more than 8,000 peer reviewed articles, and made more than 10,000 professional presentations. The Board of Regents' policy to increase teaching loads at UMS institutions is outlined. Institution-specific tables of teaching loads and productivity are included. Two appendixes provide a letter discussing modifications to the current survey and a copy of the survey form and instructions. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 405 764

A REPORT TO THE JOINT CHAIRS OF THE SENATE BUDGET AND TAXATION COMMITTEE AND THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

ON

THE WORKLOAD OF THE UMS FACULTY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John Lippincott

Univ of MD System Admin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

HE 030 002

University of Maryland System Administration
December 1, 1995

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I. INTRODUCTION

In August 1994, the Board of Regents of the University of Maryland System -- as part of its commitment to ensure quality, accountability, and efficiency in all of its operations adopted a policy for faculty productivity and a reporting process to monitor its implementation.

The UMS workload policy strikes a critical balance between providing meaningful measures of workload (for purposes of both internal management and external accountability) and the vast differences among institutions, departments, and individual faculty members. The UMS policy also strives to encourage faculty initiative and creativity and to enhance the quality of their teaching, research, and service. The UMS policy was developed in consultation with academic vice presidents, representatives of the Council of University System Faculty, the Maryland Higher Education Commission's staff, and the Office of the Attorney General.

On December 1, 1994, the UMS policy was submitted to the Maryland General Assembly along with the first comprehensive report on the workload of the UMS faculty. The policy and report responded to the FY 1995 Joint Chairmen's Report. On January 11, 1995, Senator Barbara Hoffman and Delegate Howard P. Rawlings, in a letter to Chancellor Langenberg, found that the report met the requirements outlined in the Joint Chairmen's Report.

II. FY 1996 JOINT CHAIRMEN'S REPORT

The FY 1996 Joint Chairmen's Report stated:

> *The budget committees are pleased with the progress the University of Maryland System has made towards implementing a faculty workload policy ensuring that instructional effort is balanced by equally important responsibilities for research and public service. So that the impact of the Board of Regents guidelines on the University of Maryland System institutions, faculty workload reporting should continue for the 1994-1995 academic year in the format followed for the December 1994 report, with two suggested modifications:*
>
> 1. *Where existing faculty workloads standard are to be changed as the result of implementing the Board of Regents guidelines, data should be reported in a manner permitting a clear determination of the number of faculty meeting or exceeding the current standard and the new standard.*
>
> 2. *The report include an indication of the share of effort faculty devote to instruction, research, and service, on a departmental basis. A suggested*

format would report the average share of effort devoted to each category, and the range of effort experienced within each category.

UMS staff met with staff from the Department of Fiscal Services to incorporate the modifications to the faculty workload survey instrument. It was determined that data for the second modification (share of effort devoted to instruction, research, and service) would need to be self-reported, an onerous task that may not reliably gauge effort in these areas. Since the intent to determine such efforts was to assess if tenured and tenure-track faculty devoted time to instruction commensurate with non-tenured faculty, an alternative approach was developed: to provide the student credit hours generated by type of faculty and broken down by lower division, upper division, and graduate. These data would address concerns expressed by members of the General Assembly that undergraduate students, and particularly incoming freshmen, are not exposed to the talents of more experienced tenured professors.

Another modification to the survey instrument focussed on the classification of department chairs. Most UMS institutions classify department chairs as faculty for federal reporting purposes (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System - IPEDS) and give them release time from teaching; hence these individuals appeared as "exceptions" in the 1994 report. UMCP, and to a large extent UMBC, on the other hand, classified department chairs as administrators for IPEDS[1]; thus, they were not included in the "exceptions" category. The survey instrument was modified to provide for uniformity in reporting by having all institutions report department chairs separately. Finally, at the behest of the faculty and the institutions, information was requested on full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF), on state-supported FTEF, on the number of faculty who taught more than the standard load, on the non-instructional productivity as a ratio of FTEF, and on the number of students advised.

Attachment A contains the letter from the legislative analyst confirming that "the modifications ... made to the survey instrument for the *Fall 1994 - Spring 1995 Report on Faculty Teaching Load* satisfy the intent of the budget committees as set forth in committee narrative."

III. KEY FEATURES OF THE UMS FACULTY WORKLOAD REPORT

Attachment B is a copy of the revised format and the detailed instructions. As in the UMS policy, a "course unit" was defined as equivalent to a three-credit course. Graded instructional experiences that do not follow the traditional course format (e.g., individual studies, supervision of dissertation research, supervision of student teaching, etc.) were converted to course units using the set of weights incorporated in the UMS policy.

---

[1]Beginning in academic year 1995-1996, all department chairs in the UMS institutions are classified as faculty for IPEDS reporting purposes.

The following are the main features of the data format:

- It includes data on ALL faculty;
- It is applicable to the 1994-1995 standard load for each department;
- It provides the standard teaching load during academic year 1994-1995, and the standard teaching load for 1995-1996;
- It provides the number of faculty who taught the standard load in effect in the 1994-1995 academic year (which is not necessarily the expected load called for in the Regents' policy), and the number granted exceptions to that standard, by type of exception;
- It provides the number of faculty who would have taught the standard load had the 1995-1996 been in place in academic year 1994-1995;
- It provides the number of course-equivalent units taught by the faculty;
- It provides the number of courses faculty were excepted from teaching, by type of exception;
- It provides the number of student credit hours (broken down by lower division, upper division and graduate) generated by each type of faculty;
- It provides for the faculty productivity in areas other than instruction, i.e., scholarship, research, and service; and
- It provides the data by department.

IV. LIMITATIONS

There are several limitations inherent in the report format, in the data, and in comparisons with the 1994 report:

- The data in the report reflect teaching standards in place in academic year 1994-1995, prior to implementation of the UMS workload policy. The report monitors the impact of the Board of Regents' guidelines on the University of Maryland System institutions.

- Since this format was not appropriate for the professional schools (medicine, law, dentistry, pharmacy), with their heavy emphasis on clinical instruction, they provided data in a different format.

- Because of the changes in the classification of department chairs, decreases/increases in the number of exceptions due to departmental administration can be misleading.

The data by department are appended to this report as Attachment C.

V. HIGHLIGHTS OF THE DATA REPORTED BY THE DEPARTMENTS

Tables 1 through 7 provide a summary of the data provided by the institutions. These tables do not include data for part-time faculty or teaching assistants, since they do not have a "standard" load.

Overall Summary. Table 1 is an overall summary of the number of core (tenured and tenure-track) and full-time faculty who were given exceptions to teaching the standard load, and the number of exceptions to the standard teaching load.

- 19,446 course units were taught by the tenured, tenure-track, and other full-time faculty in the UMS degree-granting institutions; ninety-four additional course units were taught by CEES and UMBI faculty. This number reflects an increase of 158 course units from the previous year - while the number of core and full-time faculty decreased by 106.

- The faculty at the degree-granting institutions were released from teaching 2,489 course units, or 11% of all course units that could have been taught by full-time faculty. As a comparison, faculty were released from teaching 2,844 course units last year, or 13% of all course units that could have been taught by full-time faculty[2].

- Of the 3,653 tenured, tenure-track and other full-time faculty at the UMS degree granting institutions, 1,111 (30%) were granted exceptions from teaching the standard.

- Thirty-four percent of the UMS faculty taught more than the standard load. This means that the number of faculty who taught more than the standard load was greater than the number with course exceptions.

---

[2] This decrease is due to some extent to the changes in the classification of department chairs.

Table 1
THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM
Faculty Instructional Workload
Fall 1994 - Spring 1995

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty*

	Analysis by Courses				Analysis by Faculty			
Institution	Total N of Course Units Taught	Total # of Course Exceptions	Possible Courses (Taught + Exceptions)	Exceptions as % of Possible N of Courses**	# of Faculty Who Taught Standard Load	# of Faculty Who Taught More Than Standard Load	# of Faculty With Course Exceptions	% of Faculty With Course Exceptions
Bowie St. Un.	1,171	95	1,266	8%	92	39	37	22%
Coppin St. Coll.	694	76	770	10%	49	31	26	25%
Frostburg St. Un.	1,704	172	1,876	9%	168	n.a.	74	31%
Salisbury St. Un.	1,682	195	1,877	10%	173	7	64	26%
Towson St. Un.	3,552	595	4,147	14%	212	71	204	42%
Un. of Baltimore	849	91	940	10%	74	43	49	30%
UMAB***	632	137	769	18%	(34)	115	62	43%
UMBC	1,912	169	2,081	8%	112	180	90	24%
UMCP	6,277	803	7,080	11%	432	694	449	29%
UMES	973	156	1,129	14%	30	54	56	40%
Degree-Granting Inst.	19,446	2,489	21,935	11%	1,308	1,234	1,111	30%
CEES	48							
UMBI	46							
UMS	19,540							

* Tenured and tenure-track faculty, other full-time instructional and research faculty, and department chairs.
** N of Exceptions/(Course Units Taught + N of Exemptions)
*** Excluding professional schools: law, medicine, dentistry and pharmacy.

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM

Faculty Instructional Workload

Fall 1994 - Spring 1995

Analysis of Course Exceptions by Type

Institution		# of Course Unit Exceptions to Expected Teaching Load by Type									Total # of Course Except.
		Instruction	Department. Administrat.**	External Research	Department. Research	Service: Profession	Service: Internal	Service: Public	Sabbatical*	Other	
Bowie St. Un.	#	10	35	5	4	0	11	8	9	13	95
		11%	37%	5%	4%	0%	12%	8%	9%	14%	100%
Coppin St. Coll.	#	15	13	17	0	2	7	2	13	7	76
		20%	17%	22%	0%	3%	9%	3%	17%	9%	100%
Frostburg St. Un.	#	52	37	3	7	2	13	1	53	4	172
		30%	22%	2%	4%	1%	8%	1%	31%	2%	100%
Salisbury St. Un.	#	28	11	26	4	2	20	0	88	16	195
		14%	6%	13%	2%	1%	10%	0%	45%	8%	100%
Towson St. Un.	#	92	200	62	27	17	28	0	120	49	595
		15%	34%	10%	5%	3%	5%	0%	20%	8%	100%
Un. of Baltimore	#	2	17	32	13	0	12	0	6	9	91
		2%	19%	35%	14%	0%	13%	0%	7%	10%	100%
UMAB****	#	30	32	38	8	8	7	5	2	7	137
		22%	23%	28%	6%	6%	5%	4%	1%	5%	100%
UMBC	#	22	9	39	7	4	1	6	63	18	169
		13%	5%	23%	4%	2%	1%	4%	37%	11%	100%
UMCP	#	164	130	167	106	10	27	19	170	10	803
		20%	16%	21%	13%	1%	3%	2%	21%	1%	100%
UMES	#	25	4	84	2	0	0	0	7	34	156
		16%	3%	54%	1%	0%	0%	0%	4%	22%	100%
UMS	#	440	488	473	178	45	126	41	531	167	2,498
		18%	20%	19%	7%	2%	5%	2%	21%	7%	100%

UMSA OAA Nov 1994

* These are NOT the number of faculty on sabbatical, rather the number of courses the faculty on sabbatical did not teach. See Table 3 for the number of faculty on sabbatical.

** These are exceptions for faculty other than department chairs, whose reduced loads are factored in through a reduced expected teaching load. This is different from last year's report, in which the reduced loads of most department chairs (except for UMCP and UMBC) were classified as "exceptions."

***Excluding professional schools: law, medicine, dentistry and pharmacy.

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE UMS WORKLOAD POLICY

UMSA OAA Nov...

Analysis of Course Exceptions by Type. Table 2 is an analysis of the number of exceptions to the expected teaching load by type:

- Externally funded research accounted for 19% of course load exceptions; most of these exceptions were found in the UMS research institutions.

- 21% of the exceptions to the standard load were for faculty members on sabbatical. As shown in Table 3, the *number* of faculty on either one semester or one year's sabbatical was 199, 5.4% of all tenured and tenure-track faculty - lower than last year's 6.5%.

Table 3
THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM
Number of Faculty on Sabbatical

Fall 1994 - Spring 1995

	# of Faculty On Sabbatical*	Total # of Faculty**	% of Faculty On Sabbatical	# of Course Exceptions
Bowie St. Un.	3	100	3.0%	9
Coppin St. Coll.	3	99	3.0%	13
Frostburg St. Un.	14	218	6.4%	54
Salisbury St. Un.	22	199	11.1%	88
Towson St. Un.	27	449	6.0%	120
Un. of Baltimore	3	155	1.9%	6
UMAB	16	668	2.4%	n.a.
UMBC	20	316	6.3%	63
UMCP	89	1,384	6.4%	170
UMES	2	72	2.8%	7
UMS	199	3,660	5.4%	530

* Either one semester or one year sabbatical.
** Tenured and tenure-track faculty and departmental administrators..

- Departmental administration accounted for 20% of course load exceptions.

- Instruction-related demands accounted for 18%, "other" for 7%, and service for 9% of course load exceptions.

- The 1994-1995 overall distribution of exceptions by type was very similar to that reported for the 1993-1994 time period.

Non-Instructional Productivity. Table 4 is a summary of the UMS faculty non-instructional (mostly scholarly) productivity. The data by institution is provided as a ratio of FTEF[3]

- $315 million was obtained by the UMS institutions in externally funded research and training grants awarded to faculty members (this figure does not include institutional grants such as Title III). In the UMS research institutions, the ratio per FTEF was $337,000 at UMBI, $189,000 at CEES, $92,998 at UMCP, $83,000 at UMAB, and $71,000 at UMBC. The ratio for UB and UMES was around $35,000 per FTEF.

- The UMS faculty published 800 books, more than 8,000 peer reviewed articles, and made more than 10,000 professional presentations; and

- The UMS faculty spent 10-20 days per faculty member in service to business, government, schools, their institutions, and their profession.

Student Credit Hours Generated by the Core Faculty. Table 5 shows the number of student credit hours (SCH) generated by the core faculty by upper division, lower division, and graduate. At the lower division level, 51% of all SCH were generated by core faculty. This is the level for all introductory and freshman courses. At the upper division level, 59% of all SCH were generated by core faculty. Finally, at the graduate level, 71% of all SCH were generated by core faculty. These data show that the UMS institutions are responsive to the concern expressed by members of the General Assembly that undergraduate students be exposed to the talents of more experienced tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Impact of the Regents' Policy. Table 6 shows the number of departments that will increase their standard load as a result of the Regents' policy. This table also shows the number of departments exempted from the institutional policy, as provided by the Regents'policy[4].

- All departments at Bowie, Coppin, Frostburg, Towson, and UMES have a standard load of eight courses, and no increases are necessary to comply with the Regents' policy. All departments at Salisbury, except those in the School of Business, have a standard load of eight courses; the standard load for the business departments will continue to be six courses a year, following accreditation requirements.

- The University of Baltimore will increase the standard load (from 6 to 7 courses) for all departments except business, which will increase from 5 to 6 courses (as determined by accreditation standards). Public administration will continue its

[3] FTE core faculty.

[4] The Regents' policy states that "...there may be differences across departments of an institution, as approved by the president."

Table 4
THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM
Faculty Non-Instructional Productivity
Per Full-Time Equivalent Faculty*

Fall 1994 - Spring 1995**

Institution	$s in Externally-Funded Grants & Contracts*** Ratio Per FTEF	# of Books Published Ratio Per FTEF	# of Refereed Publications Ratio Per FTEF	# of Non-Ref. Publications Ratio Per FTEF	# of Creative Activities Ratio Per FTEF	# of Professional Presentations Ratio Per FTEF	# of Days Spent in Public Serv. Ratio Per FTEF
Bowie St. University	$7,785	0.1	0.3	0.6	1.7	0.8	17.4
Coppin St. College	$11,238	0.0	0.5	0.2	1.0	0.8	20.8
Frostburg St. University	$4,263	0.1	0.3	0.7	4.4	1.5	11.7
Salisbury St. University	$7,314	0.1	0.8	0.7	0.8	1.6	9.1
Towson St. University	$4,674	0.2	0.7	0.7	1.3	1.5	14.0
Un. of Baltimore	$35,189	0.2	1.1	1.3	0.7	1.6	22.7
UMAB****	$82,779	0.1	2.2	2.4	0.2	2.3	10.2
UMBC	$71,298	0.2	2.2	0.7	0.8	2.1	10.8
UMCP	$92,998	0.2	2.5	1.5	1.4	3.3	13.0
UMES	$36,591	0.1	0.8	0.9	1.3	0.9	17.5
CEES	$189,591	0.2	3.0	1.8	n.a.	4.6	9.4
UMBI	$337,705	0.5	5.3	2.2	0.1	4.6	16.2
All UMS - Total Units	**$314,779,750**	**801**	**8,331**	**6,565**	**4,676**	**10,844**	**56,492**

* FTEF tenured/tenure track faculty (excluding department chairs) and full-time instructional and research faculty.
** For some institutions, the data are for the 1993-1994 academic year.
*** Does not include grants awarded to non-department units; e.g., Title III grants.
**** Including the professional schools: law, medicine, dentistry and pharmacy.

UMSA:OAA: Nov-95

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5
THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM
Student Credit Hours Generated by Core Faculty*
- By Level -
Fall 1994 - Spring 1995

LOWER DIVISION STUDENT CREDIT HOURS

	# of LD SCH	% of Total LD SCH	Total Lower Division SCH
Bowie St. Un.	19,800	57%	34,547
Coppin St. Coll.	22,212	46%	48,538
Frostburg St. Un.	45,910	70%	65,184
Salisbury St. Un.	39,556	51%	77,812
Towson St. Un.	105,429	62%	170,587
Un. of Baltimore	1,725	53%	3,237
UMAB**	0		0
UMBC	39,815	37%	106,427
UMCP	166,948	48%	345,083
UMES	15,364	29%	52,828
UMS	456,757	51%	903,831

UPPER DIVISION STUDENT CREDIT HOURS

	# of LD SCH	% of Total LD SCH	Total Upper Division SCH
Bowie St. Un.	12,764	53%	24,215
Coppin St. Coll.	11,437	55%	20,780
Frostburg St. Un.	36,879	72%	51,203
Salisbury St. Un.	39,495	70%	56,223
Towson St. Un.	81,601	66%	122,842
Un. of Baltimore	20,473	54%	37,881
UMAB**	6,238	34%	18,464
UMBC	47,787	46%	102,979
UMCP	151,938	60%	252,292
UMES	8,957	36%	24,731
UMS	417,569	59%	711,410

GRADUATE STUDENT CREDIT HOURS

	# of LD SCH	% of Total LD SCH	Total Graduate SCH
Bowie St. Un.	6,947	60%	11,614
Coppin St. Coll.	3,497	55%	6,359
Frostburg St. Un.	5,192	65%	8,048
Salisbury St. Un.	3,310	70%	4,739
Towson St. Un.	10,941	72%	15,092
Un. of Baltimore	36,767	82%	44,975
UMAB**	15,590	49%	31,914
UMBC	10,341	67%	15,482
UMCP	67,971	80%	84,792
UMES	1,430	37%	3,892
UMS	161,986	71%	226,907

* Tenured and tenure-track faculty.
** Excluding the professional schools: law, medicine, dentistry and pharmacy.

UMSA:OAA: Nov-95

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

current standard (6 courses), as will the law school (4 courses, as determined by accreditation standards).

- The University of Maryland Baltimore County will increase the standard load of three departments (computer science, African-American studies, and sociology & anthropology) from 4 to 5 courses. In accordance with the Regents' policy, UMBC has granted exceptions from the institutional standard of five courses to nine departments: biology, chemistry & biochemistry, information systems management, mathematics, mechanical engineering, physics, geography, policy sciences, and psychology. Generally, these departments obtain significant outside research support and are at the core of UMBC's mission. If, however, the Regents' policy is revised so that the expected load of faculty whose salary is paid, to some extent, by research grants, then UMBC's standard load for all departments will be at least five course units and there will be no departmental exceptions.

- The University of Maryland College Park will not grant any blanket departmental exception to the institutional standard of five courses. "Teaching is an integral part of our faculty's responsibilities, and all instructional faculty are expected to play a significant role in that regard. Obviously, faculty who have external grant funds will have an opportunity to be awarded individual exceptions, and some departments will have a larger proportion of such exceptions. But eachindividual faculty member will need to justify his or her research productivity in order to receive individual reductions."[1]

Finally, Table 7 shows (as requested by the budget language) the UMS decrease in the number of faculty who taught the standard load if the new increased standards had been in effect at the time. While 1,535 faculty taught the standard in 1994-1995, only 1,279 would have been so classified had the increased standards been in effect.

Departmental Summary. A set of institutional tables summarizes the departmental data. For each department, the following data are included: the standard teaching load of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, and the total number of course exceptions, the number of faculty who taught the standard load or more, the number of faculty granted course exceptions, and selected indicators (as a ratio of FTEF) of non-instructional productivity, e.g., books published, grants and contracts. The departments are grouped by general discipline area (humanities, sciences, education, etc.).

[1] Memo of October 24, 1995 from President Kirwan to Chancellor Langenberg

Table 6

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM

Analysis of Departmental Exceptions to Teaching Load

- When UMS Policy is Fully Implemented -

	Institut. Load*	# of Departments Increasing Standard	# of Departments With Exceptions
Bowie St. Un.	8	0	0
Coppin St. Coll.	8	0	0
Frostburg St. Un.	7-8	0	0
Salisbury St. Un.	8	0	4
Towson St. Un.	8	0	0
Un. of Baltimore	7	5	3
UMAB**	5	0	0
UMBC	5	3	9
UMCP	5	48	0
UMES	8	0	0
UMS	[redacted]	54	7

* Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty. UMSA:OAA:

** Excluding the professional schools: medicine, dentistry, law & pharmacy.

Table 7

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM

Decrease in the Number of Faculty Who Taught Standard Load Had Future Expected Loads Been in Place This Year

	Decrease in # of Faculty Teaching Expected Load
Bowie St. Un.	0
Coppin St. Coll.	0
Frostburg St. Un.	0
Salisbury St. Un.	0
Towson St. Un.	0
Un. of Baltimore	117 to 108
UMAB*	0
UMBC	292 to 284
UMCP	1126 to 887
UMES	0
UMS	1535 to 1279

* Excluding the professional schools.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This report shows that solid progress has been made in increasing the productivity and accountability of the UMS faculty - the impact of the Regents' policy is already detectable. These increases in productivity are congruent with the goals adopted by the Regents in "*Toward a State of Learning*" (Vision III).

The data reported by the institutions also suggest possible refinements to the reporting format:

- In the research institutions, the significant number of faculty whose salary is paid, to some extent, by research grants[4] suggests that their expected load could be modified accordingly.

- Refinements may be incorporated to further encourage accountability at the department level.

- The format may include the number of "contact hours" generated by the faculty, a useful indicator of faculty productivity in some disciplines, such as art, music, lab sciences, etc.

[4] For example, at UMCP, 138 FTEF are supported with outside funds.

BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	94-95 Instructional Workload					94-95 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except.*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	# of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession. Presentat. per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
Communications	8	0	11	0	0%	0.1	0.4	3.3	0.7	$0	3.2
Fine Arts	8	1	6	1	14%	0.0	0.4	13.3	1.1	$0	14.8
Nat. Science & Math	8	6	27	3	10%	0.0	0.2	0.5	0.3	$0	21.7
Comp Science	8	11	6	5	48%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	$0	10.6
Nursing	8	11	0	4	100%	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	$0	20.5
Bness/Pub Admin/Econ	8	16	27	4	13%	0.1	0.2	0.2	1.0	$0	17.4
Education & Phys. Ed.	8	18	14	7	33%	0.0	0.1	0.6	1.4	$0	13.2
Behav. Sc/Human Serv	8	10	17	4	19%	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.3	$0	16.2
Hist/Pol Sc/Internat St	8	6	8	3	27%	1.0	1.8	2.2	2.1	$0	13.8
English/Modern Lang.	8	16	15	6	29%	0.0	0.3	0.5	0.5	$0	10.2
BSU	[redacted]	95	131	37	22%	0.1	0.3	1.7	0.8	$0	17.4

UMSA.OAA Nov. 1995

* The types of exceptions vary by department. See departmental reports.

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

COPPIN STATE COLLEGE

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	94-95 Instructional Workload					94-95 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except.*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	# of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession Presental. per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
Fine & Comm. Arts	8	9.67	5	3	38%	0.0	0.0	10.6	1.1	$0	0.0
Lang/Lit/Journ/Phil.	8	4	13	2	13%	0.0	0.2	1.0	0.3	$0	26.1
Math & Comp. Science	8	11.33	6	3	33%	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	$26,569	29.0
Natural Science	6	6	7	3	30%	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.6	$28,111	22.8
Nursing	8	2	11	1	8%	0.1	0.1	0.4	1.3	$32,332	44.0
Management Science	8	0	7	0	0%	0.0	0.8	0.2	0.7	$0	7.8
General and Adult Ed.	8	2	3	1	25%	0.3	0.3	1.0	0.3	$0	30.0
Curriculum & Instruction	8	10	3	3	50%	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.6	$8,000	28.2
Hlth/Phys Ed/Rec/Danc	8	2	3	1	25%	0.0	0.3	4.0	0.7	$46,030	72.7
Spcecial Education	8	2	5	2	29%	0.0	0.8	0.3	0.5	$26,750	29.0
Psych & Rehab Couns	8	4	5	1	17%	0.0	4.4	0.0	1.6	$0	10.6
Criminal Justice	8	6	4	1	20%	0.5	1.0	0.0	2.5	$5,341	4.0
Hist/Geo/Internat St	8	13	2	3	60%	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.7	$17,353	23.0
Social Sc/Soc Work	8	4	6	2	25%	0.0	0.3	0.1	1.1	$0	13.0
CSC	[redacted]	76	80	26	25%	0.0	0.5	1.0	0.8	$11,238	20.8

* The types of exceptions vary by department. See departmental reports.

UMSA:OAA: Nov. 1995

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	94-95 Instructional Workload					94-95 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except.*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	# of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession Presentat. per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
Communic/Theatre	7	6	7	3	30%	0.0	0.0	4.2	1.2	$259	8.2
English	7	31	10	11	52%	0.0	0.7	0.5	1.1	$292	6.1
Music	7	0	8	0	0%	0.3	0.1	20.0	3.3	$0	16.4
Philosophy	8	3	5	0	0%	0.7	0.7	0.0	1.0	$0	26.7
Visual Arts	7	0	9	0	0%	0.0	0.0	4.5	2.9	$5,369	16.0
Biology	7	10	10	4	29%	0.1	0.6	1.5	1.8	$9,992	8.0
Chemistry	7	0	5	0	0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	$131	11.0
Computer Science	8	2	8	1	11%	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	$28,193	25.2
Mathematics	8	2	11	2	15%	0.0	0.0	33.9	0.8	$7,083	16.4
Physics	7	5	4	3	43%	0.2	0.0	9.1	3.5	$3,877	14.5
Accounting	8	19	4	6	60%	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.9	$0	12.0
Business Administration	8	16	9	7	44%	0.2	0.8	0.2	1.1	$655	12.4
MBA Department	7	17	1	13	93%	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.8	$48	11.8
Educational Prof.	7	10	18	2	10%	0.0	0.1	0.0	4.8	$3,067	19.0
Health, Phys Ed & Rec	7	24	5	12	71%	0.1	0.4	11.7	0.2	$3,176	8.4
Economics	8	2	6	1	14%	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.5	$3,000	2.5
Geography	7	4	9	2	18%	0.3	0.5	0.0	0.9	$18,441	10.2
History	8	0	8	0	0%	0.3	1.1	0.1	0.3	$4,643	4.6
Political Science	8	6	6	3	33%	0.0	0.0	0.3	2.5	$0	4.1
Social Work	8	4	3	1	25%	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	$500	12.5

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FU' ' IMPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	94-95 Instructional Workload					94-95 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except.*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	# of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession Presental. per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
Sociology	8	3	4	1	20%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	$8,750	18.8
Psychology	7	8	10	2	17%	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	$0	10.5
Foreign Lang & Lit.	8	0	8	0	0%	0.0	0.9	2.2	1.6	$1,703	6.4
FSU		172	168	74	31%	0.1	0.3	4.4	1.5	$4,263	11.7

* The types of exceptions vary by department. See departmental reports.

UMSA:OAA. Nov. 1995

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

SALISBURY STATE UNIVERSITY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	94-95 Instructional Workload					94-95 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except.*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	# of Books per FTEF	# of Publical Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession Presentat. per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
Art	8	6	4	2	33%	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.2	$167	8.0
Communication Arts	8	7	10	3	23%	0.2	0.2	4.1	1.7	$0	9.5
English	8	29	8	8	50%	0.1	1.1	0.3	1.0	$388	8.6
Music	8	4	5	1	17%	0.0	1.0	8.5	3.0	$1,017	19.5
Philosophy	8	0	4	0	0%	0.0	1.0	0.3	2.8	$300	3.3
Biology	8	22	13	8	38%	0.0	1.6	0.2	1.1	$8,032	9.5
Chemistry	8	2	12	1	8%	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.4	$5,769	2.7
Med Tech/Resp Ther	8	0	7	0	0%	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.7	$0	3.7
Math & Comp. Sc.	8	19	10	7	41%	0.1	0.3	0.2	1.5	$2,647	21.6
Nursing	8	14	12	4	25%	0.0	0.2	0.1	1.3	$4,375	5.1
Physics	8	2	5	1	17%	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.5	$7,833	1.3
Accounting/Legal St.	6	0	6	0	0%	0.2	1.7	0.0	1.3	$46,033	17.4
Marketing & Mgment.	6	11	8	4	33%	0.6	2.6	0.4	3.3	$35,385	17.4
Economics & Finance	6	4	6	1	14%	0.3	1.6	0.4	1.6	$0	0.4
Info. & Decision Sc.	6	0	7	0	0%	0.0	2.3	0.0	1.4	$0	6.9
Education	8	18	14	5	26%	0.1	0.3	0.1	2.4	$1,645	2.3
Physical Ed.	8	13	4	4	50%	0.0	0.3	1.1	1.3	$156	13.6
Geography	8	8	6	2	25%	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.6	$0	5.1
History & Anthropology	8	13	16	4	20%	0.4	0.3	1.2	1.1	$500	9.5
Leisure Studies	Not Applic	0	1	0	0%	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	$0	20.0

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FUL IMPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

SALISBURY STATE UNIVERSITY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	94-95 Instructional Workload					94-95 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except.*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	# of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession Presentat. per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
Political Sc.	8	5	2	2	50%	0 0	1 3	0 0	1 0	$0	0 5
Psychology	8	12	8	5	38%	0 0	0 4	0 0	1 9	$33,372	3 0
Social Work	8	2	4	1	20%	0 0	0 6	0 0	1 4	$0	4 4
Sociology	8	4	3	1	25%	0 0	0 0	0 3	0 0	$0	0 8
Modern Foreign Lang.	8	0	5	0	0%	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 6	$0	0 6
SSU		195	180	64	26%	0 1	0 8	0 8	1 6	$7,314	9 1

* The types of exception vary by department. See departmental reports.

UMSA:OAA: Nov-95

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	94-95 Instructional Workload					94-95 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except *	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	# of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession Presentat. per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
Art	8	19	13	5	28%	0 0	0 1	2 1	0 2	$118	8 5
Dance	8	9	1	3	75%	0 0	0 7	6 7	7 0	$3,683	31 0
English	8	30	26	13	33%	0 3	1 2	0 5	0 8	$2,573	3 1
Music	8	23	18	9	33%	0 5	0 2	9 8	0 7	$984	11 6
Speech & Mass Comm	8	37	13	11	46%	0 2	1 0	0 5	1 3	$6,475	6 0
Theatre Arts	8	17	1	9	90%	0 0	1 9	13 1	0 4	$233	20 8
Biological Sciences	8	12	18	5	22%	0 1	0 5	0 1	1 0	$932	46 4
Chemistry	8	4	9	1	10%	0 6	0 3	2 2	0 4	$2,667	3 7
Comm. Sc & Disorders	8	20	6	4	40%	0 2	0 0	0 6	2 9	$0	43 4
Computer & Info Sc.	8	27	10	10	50%	0 1	1 6	0 0	0 5	$5,465	10 3
Health Science	8	15	8	4	33%	0 1	0 6	0 5	1 4	$10,086	43 6
Mathematics	8	26	14	11	44%	0 3	0 5	0 9	1 1	$5,001	3 8
Nursing	8	21	11	5	31%	0 1	0 6	0 5	0 3	0	12 8
Occupational Therapy	8	9	7	2	22%	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 9	$4,912	13 6
Physics	8	17	11	4	27%	0 4	0 1	0 1	1 4	$7,707	14 4
Accounting	8	23	2	10	83%	0 1	1 7	0 0	0 6	$0	16 8
Finance	8	11	2	5	71%	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	$0	0 0
Management	8	39	4	12	75%	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	$0	0 0
Marketing	8	4	8	1	11%	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	$0	0 0
Early Childhood Ed	8	18	6	4	40%	0 1	0 5	1 9	3 8	$16,600	26 1
Elementary Education	8	13	9	7	44%	0 2	0 5	0 0	2 3	$0	26 8

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FUI ' IMPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	94-95 Instructional Workload					94-95 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except.*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	# of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession Presental. per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
General Education	8	10	7	7	50%	0.2	0.5	0.8	1.7	$2,869	5.3
Physical Education	8	18	11	5	31%	0.2	0.3	1.3	3.6	$0	14.5
Secondary Education	8	18	6	5	45%	0.3	0.6	0.4	2.7	$0	15.0
Economics	8	31	2	12	86%	0.2	0.9	0.6	0.5	$0	10.3
Geo & Env. Planning	8	7	5	4	44%	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.4	$12,125	3.3
History	8	8	14	2	13%	0.8	1.0	0.2	0.7	$0	4.8
Philosophy	8	12	5	3	38%	0.0	0.9	0.0	3.2	$0	0.0
Political Science	8	12	6	4	40%	0.1	0.6	0.0	1.8	$0	57.3
Psychology	8	58	7	21	75%	0.1	1.5	0.1	5.6	$0	11.4
Sociology/Anthropology	8	20	9	4	31%	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.8	$0	13.2
Women Studies	8	0	6	0	0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	$0	0.0
Modern Languages	8	7	8	2	20%	0.1	1.6	0.3	0.3	$0	5.9
TSU	[redacted]	595	283	204	42%	0.2	0.7	1.3	1.5	$4,674	14.0

* The types of exceptions vary by department. See departmental reports.

UMSA:OAA: Nov. 1994

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

THE UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

Department	94-95 Instructional Workload: Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except *	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	94-95 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF: # of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession. Presentat. per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
Lang/Lit/Comm Des.	6	11	13	5	28%	0.3	2.0	4.2	1.5	$469	30.6
School of Law	4	10	38	5	12%	0.3	0.7	0.0	1.5	$2,093	23.7
School of Business	5	35	42	23	35%	0.2	1.4	0.2	1.8	$56,421	15.5
Psych/Quant Methods	6	9	7	3	30%	0.0	0.4	0.0	1.0	$7,474	17.9
Legal/Ethical/History	6	3	7	3	30%	1.2	0.6	2.5	0.4	$788	11.5
Govern/Public Admin	6	21	3	9	75%	0.0	1.3	0.3	1.7	$152,582	49.7
Crim/Crim Just/Soc Pol	6	2	7	1	13%	0.4	0.9	0.0	1.9	$34,197	27.9
UB	[redacted]	91	117	49	30%	0.2	1.1	0.7	1.6	$35,189	22.7

UMSA:OAA: Nov 95

* The types of exception vary by department. See departmental reports.

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FUL' 'MPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT BALTIMORE

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	94-95 Instructional Workload					94-95 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except.*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	# of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession. Presentat. per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
School of Nursing	6	71	51	35	41%	1.5	1.5	1.7	2.6	$32,506	20.2
School of Social Work	5	66	30	27	47%	0.1	1.5	0.4	2.9	$26,114	23.3
School of Medicine	n.a.	n.a	912	13	1%	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a
School of Dentistry	n.a.	n.a	79	35	31%	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a
School of Pharmacy	n.a.	n.a	48	12	20%	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a
School of Law	n.a.	n.a	41	8	16%	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a	n.a
UMAB**	[redacted]	137	81	62	43%	0.1	2.2	0.2	2.3	$82,779	10.2

UMSA:OAA: Nov-95

* The types of exception vary by department. See departmental reports.

** Instructional workload includeds schools of Nursing and Social Work only. Non-instructional workload includes all schools.

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE COUNTY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	94-95 Instructional Workload					94-95 Non Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except *	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% OF Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	# of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession Presental per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
American Studies	5	0	5	0	0%	1.0	0.5	0.3	2.0	$0	8.0
Ancient Studies	5	8	2	3	60%	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	$15,882	2.6
Dance	5	2	3	1	25%	0.0	0.7	3.0	2.0	$2,367	1.3
English	5	13	14	11	44%	0.5	2.5	0.5	0.7	$224	3.7
Music	5	1	7	1	13%	0.5	6.3	6.8	1.2	$0	15.6
Philosophy	5	9	5	3	38%	0.3	0.6	1.0	2.9	$0	0.3
Theatre	6	2	7	2	22%	0.0	2.1	3.5	1.3	$1,917	4.3
Visual & Perform Arts	5	2	14	1	7%	0.1	0.6	3.1	1.3	$10,813	1.6
Biology	3.5	14	19	12	39%	0.0	1.9	0.1	1.7	$89,932	6.1
Chem & Biochem Eng	5	2	7	1	13%	0.0	4.5	0.0	4.0	$101,091	6.5
Chemistry & Biochem	2	5	16	3	16%	0.6	3.6	1.3	7.7	$217,879	16.5
Computer Science	4	1	16	1	6%	0.6	3.3	0.3	1.4	$56,561	3.6
Electrical Engineering	5	8	2	6	75%	0.3	7.7	1.7	7.3	$267,904	8.1
Emergency Health Sc	5	13	2	3	60%	0.0	0.8	0.3	0.5	$0	24.0
Info System Mgment	4	1	10	1	9%	0.1	2.7	0.1	1.7	$26,041	1.5
Mathematics	4	10	20	6	23%	0.0	2.4	0.1	1.5	$18,982	19.8
Mechanical Engineering	4	2	12	2	14%	0.1	2.9	0.0	2.4	$78,272	3.5
Physics	3	2	15	3	17%	0.2	3.9	0.0	1.9	$40,588	4.1
Education	5	6	12	2	14%	0.5	0.9	0.2	3.5	$68,630	16.9
African-American St	4	4	6	1	14%	0.5	0.8	0.7	1.5	$0	18.0
Economics/Admin Sc	5	4	14	4	22%	0.1	0.5	0.0	0.7	$994	21.0

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FUL' 'MPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE COUNTY

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	94-95 Instructional Workload					94-95 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except *	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% OF Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	# of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession Presentat. per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
Geography	4	2	8	1	11%	0 3	1 5	0 0	2 4	$32,857	13 8
History	5	4	13	3	19%	0 4	0 7	0 4	1 1	$9,862	22 1
Policy Science	4	12	4	3	43%	0 2	4 0	0 0	2 7	$220,924	22 2
Political Science	5	8	7	5	42%	0 6	1 4	4 6	1 3	$0	20 6
Psychology	4	14	21	3	13%	0 0	2 7	0 5	1 8	$30,336	11 1
Socy/Anth/Health Sc Po	4	9	13	4	24%	0 3	1 7	0 8	1 4	$563,536	17 5
Social Work	5	5	6	1	14%	0 0	0 3	0 0	2 0	$21,408	9 2
Modern Languages	5	6	12	3	20%	0 1	0 9	0 0	1 9	$0	6 7
UMBC	[illegible]	169	292	90	24%	0 2	2 2	0 8	2 1	$71,298	10 8

* The types of exceptions vary by department. See departmental reports.

UMSA:OAA: Nov-95

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	94-95 Instructional Workload					94-95 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except.*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	# of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession Presentat per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
American Studies	6	0	8	0	0%	0.1	0.3	0.1	2.9	$5,000	6.1
Art	5	11	14	6	30%	0.4	0.2	6.4	2.1	$138	14.2
Art Hist & Archeology	4	5	11	4	27%	0.0	1.1	0.3	1.1	$11,474	4.0
Classics	5	5	3	4	57%	0.3	2.0	0.6	0.6	$0	3.4
Comparative Literature	4	1	7	1	13%	0.6	1.4	1.2	3.1	$0	15.5
Dance	5	6	7	2	22%	0.0	0.0	6.9	1.8	$166	6.3
English	5	72	34	33	49%	0.3	1.4	1.1	2.0	$3,719	3.4
Journalism	5	5	14	6	30%	0.4	1.8	0.6	2.6	$2,171	8.7
Library & Info. Services	5	2	12	2	14%	0.2	1.4	0.1	3.3	$26,993	10.2
Music	5	25	29	15	34%	0.1	0.3	24.9	1.8	$7,298	12.9
Philosophy	4	6	17	5	23%	0.2	2.1	0.1	4.5	$8,782	2.4
Speech Communicabon	5	1	7	1	13%	0.3	2.1	0.3	3.7	$5,639	3.9
Theatre	5	10	9	6	40%	0.2	0.1	10.8	1.3	$0	4.6
Architecture	4	19	14	10	42%	0.1	0.9	0.7	1.7	$14,219	15.3
Ag Resource Econ.	4	2	24	3	11%	0.0	4.5	0.1	10.7	$41,228	62.5
Agronomy	4	4	17	4	19%	0.9	8.1	1.6	12.9	$312,087	74.3
Animal Science	4	1	14	2	13%	0.0	8.5	0.2	9.8	$212,435	58.8
Bio Resources Eng.	4	3	6	2	25%	0.0	4.7	4.0	9.9	$84,173	45.0
Institutute of Applied Ag	4	3	5	1	17%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	$0	2.0
Horticulture	3	0	15	0	0%	0.3	3.1	1.2	0.0	$141,780	68.5
Nutrition & Food Sc	4	12	6	7	54%	0.2	1.9	0.0	3.2	$11,298	10.4
Poultry Science	4	0	8	0	0%	0.7	16.4	2.7	43.2	$43,344	411.0

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FUI ' 'MPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	94-95 Instructional Workload					94-95 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except *	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	# of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession Presentat. per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
Veterinary Medicine	3	8	6	3	33%	0.5	5.6	1.3	8.2	$1,410	100.9
Astronomy	2	3	17	5	23%	0.3	7.5	5.2	8.0	$250,745	31.9
Chemistry & Biochem	5	67	15	30	67%	0.2	3.6	0.3	3.3	$180,076	6.5
Computer Science	2	1	40	1	2%	0.8	11.6	0.7	10.0	$387,019	12.7
Entomology	5	16	7	7	50%	0.2	7.8	0.0	12.2	$202,650	88.3
Geology	4	4	11	1	8%	0.1	1.9	0.3	3.0	$32,308	13.5
Mathematics	4	54	58	34	37%	0.1	1.0	0.2	1.5	$33,210	2.0
Meteorology	3	4	7	2	22%	0.0	4.9	2.5	6.9	$729,520	12.6
Microbiology	2	1	12	1	8%	0.2	4.4	0.4	4.3	$73,770	7.4
Physics	2	14	75	11	13%	0.0	3.9	0.0	3.8	$238,621	1.4
Plant Biology	5	28	8	15	65%	0.3	3.1	0.4	2.8	$85,240	7.5
Zoology	5	50	12	20	63%	0.3	3.1	0.0	3.3	$76,506	5.9
Aerospace Engineering	4	6	11	6	35%	0.1	3.5	0.0	4.5	$514,509	14.0
Chemical Engineering	4	4	11	1	8%	0.3	6.4	0.0	8.3	$127,485	26.9
Civil Engineering	5	12	20	7	26%	0.8	3.3	0.1	3.2	$142,005	11.7
Electrical Engineering	4	28	46	15	25%	0.3	5.4	0.1	4.0	$420,822	7.2
Fire Protection Eng	4	4	4	1	20%	0.2	3.1	0.0	5.3	$25,697	19.8
Materials & Nuclear Eng	4	8	21	7	25%	0.7	3.4	0.3	2.9	$195,823	4.8
Mechanical Engineering	4	39	19	26	58%	0.5	5.1	0.5	6.3	$173,734	20.1
Business & Mgment	4	28	57	17	23%	0.2	2.2	0.1	2.3	$23,549	11.1

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	94-95 Instructional Workload					94-95 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except.*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	# of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession. Presental. per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
Counseling & Personnel	5	8	12	5	29%	0.4	1.7	0.8	3.9	$23,265	16.5
Curriculum & Instruction	5	18	26	10	28%	0.3	1.7	0.6	4.8	$25,698	23.6
Ed. Pol, Plan. & Admin.	5	15	11	8	42%	0.3	1.3	0.1	2.7	$22,191	11.3
Health Education	4	5	14	2	13%	0.4	1.0	0.1	3.3	$54,850	14.7
Human Development	5	22	10	11	52%	0.5	2.6	0.3	4.1	$96,228	31.2
Kinesiology	4	11	21	6	22%	0.2	1.6	0.1	1.8	$4,591	6.5
Measurement & Stat	5	6	4	3	43%	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.0	$0	4.3
Special Educatiojn	5	5	13	4	24%	0.1	4.0	0.2	3.7	$126,343	36.5
Afro-American Studies	4	0	7	0	0%	0.3	0.3	0.0	1.1	$40,000	3.5
Anthropology	4	2	9	1	10%	0.1	3.0	0.1	2.3	$31,392	18.5
Criminal Justice	4	2	13	1	7%	0.1	2.2	0.0	2.3	$324,254	38.7
Economics	4	13	29	8	22%	0.1	2.3	0.4	5.5	$84,280	15.4
Family Studies	4	9	7	6	46%	0.1	2.2	0.6	3.6	$41,209	35.5
Geography	4	3	15	1	6%	0.1	1.4	0.2	2.8	$207,229	7.4
Government & Politics	4	9	33	6	15%	0.3	2.2	0.2	2.6	$17,305	14.4
Hearing & Speech Sc	4	7	10	3	23%	0.0	1.7	0.0	3.3	$12,991	9.1
History	4	18	39	10	20%	0.2	1.5	0.5	1.9	$16,423	7.0
Jewish Studies	4	0	1	0	0%	0.0	4.1	0.0	6.1	$0	0.0
Linguistics	4	1	7	1	13%	0.3	3.1	0.0	2.8	$30,972	2.0
Psychology	4	15	32	9	22%	0.3	2.7	0.1	3.0	$38,748	9.9
Public Affairs	4	9	7	5	42%	0.6	4.2	1.8	7.4	$83,433	94.3
Sociology	4	18	18	9	33%	0.2	1.3	0.0	3.2	$69,801	10.9
Women Studies	4	4	5	3	38%	0.6	1.4	0.0	4.4	$27,572	5.5

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

Department	94-95 Instructional Workload: Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except.*	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	94-95 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF: # of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession. Presentat. per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
French & Italian	5	14	12	4	25%	0.5	1.5	0.1	2.0	$77	2.1
German & Slavic	4	2	13	1	7%	0.9	1.5	0.5	3.2	$3,655	9.5
Hebrew & East Asian	4	5	11	3	21%	0.1	0.7	0.1	2.8	$8,413	2.4
Spanish & Portuguese	5	10	9	5	36%	0.7	1.5	0.7	2.7	$4,381	6.7
UMCP	[redacted]	803	1,126	449	29%	0.2	2.5	1.5	1.4	$92,998	13.0

* The types of exceptions vary by department. See departmental reports.

UMSA:OAA: Nov-95

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EASTERN SHORE

Summary of Core and Full-Time Faculty Productivity By Department

	94-95 Instructional Workload					93-94 Non-Instructional Productivity - RATIO PER FTEF					
Department	Standard Load of Core Faculty	Total # of Course Except *	# of Fac. Who Taught Standard Load & More	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	% of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions	# of Books per FTEF	# of Publicat. per FTEF	# of Creative Activities per FTEF	# of Profession Presentat. per FTEF	$s in Research per FTEF	# Days in Public Service per FTEF
English	8	11	14	7	33%	0.2	1.0	2.6	0.7	$1,000	13.9
Fine Arts	8	3	7	1	13%	0.2	0.3	9.4	0.3	$0	29.4
Agriculture	8	47	4	10	71%	0.2	2.3	0.4	1.7	$237,352	40.7
Math & Computer Sc	8	10	10	6	38%	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.6	$24,878	11.7
Natural Science	8	15	11	9	45%	0.2	1.1	0.2	1.2	$23,314	5.4
Physical Therapy	8	8	3	2	40%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	$23,600	29.3
Technology	8	3	3	2	40%	0.0	0.4	0.8	0.8	$4,956	24.0
Airway Science	n.a.	0	1	0	0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	$0	0.0
Business	8	3	9	2	18%	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.2	$0	24.7
Hotel & Restaurant Mgt	8	1	4	2	33%	0.0	0.0	7.5	0.0	$0	12.7
Education	8	4	5	2	29%	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	$46,009	3.8
Physical Education	8	32	3	7	70%	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.3	$8,580	8.7
Human Ecology	8	18	2	5	71%	0.0	0.7	0.5	1.3	$59,392	20.7
Social Science	8	1	8	1	11%	0.1	0.6	0.0	0.6	$1,594	21.8
UMES	[redacted]	156	84	56	40%	0.1	0.8	1.3	0.9	$36,591	17.5

UMSA:OAA: Nov-95

* The types of exceptions vary by department. See departmental reports.

DATA REFLECT TEACHING EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF UMS POLICY

ATTACHMENT A

DEPARTMENT OF FISCAL SERVICES
MARYLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
LEGISLATIVE SERVICES BUILDING
90 STATE CIRCLE
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401-1991
(410) 841-3781

WILLIAM S. RATCHFORD, II
DIRECTOR

BARBARA A. KLEIN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

June 26, 1995

Mr. Javier Miyares
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Maryland System Administration
3300 Metzerott Road
Adelphi, MD 20783

Dear Mr. JAVIER Miyares:

As you know, committee narrative in the 1995 *Report of the State Operating Budget by the Chairmen of the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee and House Appropriations Committee* (page 153) requests that faculty workload reporting for University of Maryland System institutions continue for the 1994-1995 academic year in the format followed for the December 1994 report, with two suggested modifications:

1. Where existing faculty workload standards are to be changed as the result of implementing the Board of Regents guidelines, data should be reported in a manner permitting the clear determination of the number of faculty meeting or exceeding the current standard and the new standard.

2. The report include an indication of the shares of effort faculty devote to instruction, research, and service, on a departmental basis. A suggested format would report the average share of effort devoted to each category, and the range of effort experienced within each category.

Based upon our conversations over the past several weeks, you have altered the faculty workload survey instrument to incorporate the committees' requests as follows, modified as necessary reflect the absence or unreliability of available data.

Number of faculty meeting or exceeding the current standard and the new standard:

Line 3 of the survey instrument was modified to reflect the number of course units each faculty member was expected to teach during the academic year 1994-1995, and the number of course units expected to be taught by each faculty member in academic year 1995-1996. Line 12 of the survey form will indicate the number of faculty members who taught, or are expected to teach the number of course units specified in line 3.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Shares of effort faculty devote to instruction, research, and service, on a departmental basis:

As originally envisioned, the faculty workload report would provide a summary of each faculty member's experience with teaching, research, and service. However, based on our discussions, we determined that this data would need to be self-reported, an onerous task, and may not reliably gauge effort in these areas. In large part, the intent of determining such shares of effort was to see if tenured and tenure-track faculty devoted time to instruction commensurate with non-tenured faculty. Members of the General Assembly have often expressed concern that undergraduate students, and especially incoming freshmen, are not exposed to the talents of top-notch tenured faculty.

The alternative approach we agreed upon will provide an additional level of detail concerning student credit hours generated, by type of faculty. As you have determined, reliable data exists for lower and upper division undergraduate credit hours, and graduate credit hours, and will be reported on lines 8, 9 and 10 of the survey document. I believe reporting this data will be an acceptable and more reliable approach than that requested by the committee narrative.

In conclusion, the modifications you have made to the survey instrument for the *Fall 1994 - Spring 1995 Report on Faculty Teaching Load* satisfy the intent of the budget committees as set forth in committee narrative. If you require further guidance regarding this issue, please do not hesitate to call me at 301-858-3736.

Sincerely,

Gregory C. Sprengle
Analyst
Department of Fiscal Services
90 State Circle
Annapolis, MD 21401-1991

gcs

cc: William S. Ratchford, II
Linda L. Stahr
Rachel Hise
Kristin Terchek

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ATTACHMENT B

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM
Fall 1994 - Spring 1996 Report on Faculty Teaching Load
Institution's Name

DEPARTMENT:

Line #	Basis for Standard Teaching Load of Core Fac.:	Type of Faculty: Tenured & Tenure-Track Faculty		Department Chair		Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Inst. Faculty		Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Res. Fac.		Other Faculty	Teaching Assist	Department Total	
		94-95	95-96	94-95	95-96	94-95	95-96	94-95	95-96	94-95	94-95	94-95	95-96
1	N of Headcount Faculty			1									
2	FTEF												
2a	State-Supported FTEF (OPTIONAL)												
3	Standard Annual Course Units Load												
4	N of Courses Taught (on load)												
5	N of Other Course Units Taught (on load)												
6	Total Courses + Course Units Taught (on load)												
7	N of Student Credit Hours Generated (on load)												
8	Lower Division SCH												
9	Upper Division SCH												
10	Graduate SCH												
11	N of Courses Taught on Overload												
12	N of Faculty Who Taught Standard Load												
13	N of Faculty Who Taught More than Standard Load												
14	N of Fac Exempted from Teaching Standard Load												
	By Type of Exception (94-95) (N of Faculty | Total Course Reduction)	# Fac.	# Course	# Fac.	# Course	# Fac.	# Course	# Fac.	# Course			# Fac.	# Course
15	Instruction-Related												
16	Departmental Administration												
17	Externally Funded Research and Service												
18	Department-Supported Research												
19	Department-Supported Service - Profession												
20	Department-Supported Service - Internal												
21	Department-Supported Service - Public												
22	Sabbatical												
23	Illness/Death/Other, Specify												
	Research, Scholarship and Other Selected Activities (94-95)	#	Ratio			#	Ratio	#	Ratio			#	Ratio
24	# of Books Published												
25	# of Refereed Works												
26	# of Non-refereed Works												
27	# of Creative Activities												
28	# of Professional Presentations												
29	# of Externally Funded Grants & Contracts												
30	# of Faculty Awarded Grants												
31	$s Awarded in Grants & Contracts												
32	# of Days Spent in Public Service												
33	# of UG Students Advised												
34	# of Grad. Students Advised (OPTIONAL)												

UMSA:OAA June 1995

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

June 27, 1996

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM
FALL 1994 - SPRING 1995 REPORT ON FACULTY TEACHING LOAD

- INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS -

Time frame. The time period covered by this report is Fall 1994 and Spring 1995. The standard annual course units load (line 3), and the number of faculty who would have taught the standard load (line 12) are also requested for Fall 1995 and Spring 1996.

Type of Faculty. All information is requested by type of faculty. The last column provides for departmental totals. Some information is only requested for some type of faculty. This is indicated in the form by the shading of cells.

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty. All persons (except the department chair) holding tenured and tenure-track positions who are classified as faculty (regardless of sub-classification: instructional, research and public service), and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System.

Department Chair. The person who holds faculty rank and has administrative and academic responsibility for managing the department or unit being reported.

Full-Time, Non-Tenured, Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty. All persons who, while neither tenured nor on the tenure track, are employed full time by the UMS, are classified as instructional faculty and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System.

Full-Time Non-Tenured, Non-Tenure Track Research or Public Service Faculty. All persons who, while neither tenured nor on the tenure track, are employed full time by the UMS, are classified as research or public service faculty and so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System, and whose salaries are supported, in whole or in part, by state funds.

Other Faculty. All other persons, other than teaching assistants, who taught in this department, either in one or in both semesters. This category includes adjunct and affiliated faculty, all part-time faculty, and non-departmental administrators (deans, assistant deans, etc.) who taught in this department. The only information required for this type of faculty is their number, the number of courses and course units taught, and the student credit hours generated.

Teaching Assistants. Typically, graduate students in the department whose tuition and fees are waived, and who may receive other remuneration in return for some type of instruction-related responsibilities within the department. The only information required for teaching assistants is their number, the number of courses taught, and the student credit hours generated.

Note: If a faculty member was employed in the Spring semester, but not in the Fall (and therefore not captured on the EDS file), they should be assigned to the column they would have been in had they been in the institution for the Fall EDS.

Basis for Departmental Expected Teaching Load. Very briefly, describe the basis for the department expected teaching load for core faculty. For example, institutional policy; national practice; accreditation requirements; etc.

Line 1: Number of Headcount Faculty. Include faculty who were on sabbatical, or employed for only one semester. Do not include faculty on leave without pay for the entire academic year.

Line 2: FTE Faculty. The number of headcount faculty adjusted to reflect their assignment to the department. For example, faculty who held a joint appointment in another department or UMS institution, and part-time tenured/tenure track faculty, should be reported as a fraction based on their appointment to the reporting department.

Line 2a: State-Supported FTE Faculty (OPTIONAL). Based on the proportion of a faculty salary paid from state instructional funds. For 12 month faculty, state-supported FTEs of less than 1.0 are multiplied by 1.22.

Line 3: 94-95 and 95-96 Standard Annual Course Units Load. The number of course units that each faculty member was expected to teach during the academic year 1994-1995, and the number of course units expected to be taught by each faculty member in academic year 1995-1996. Standard loads may differ by type of faculty. For purposes of defining standard instructional workload expectations, the course unit is defined as equivalent to a three-credit course. Departments which formulate this expectation in terms of credit hours, should convert the expected teaching load, for reporting purposes, to courses; e.g., 24 credit hours being equivalent to 8 courses.

Line 4: Number of Courses Taught on Load. The total number of courses taught on load by each type of faculty. Courses should be converted to 3-credit equivalent unites. Therefore, a four-credit course would be reported in this line as 1.33.

Similarly, a two-credit course would be reported as 0.67, and a one-credit course as 0.33. A course should be attributed to only one faculty. Team taught courses and courses taught with the assistance of teaching assistants should be prorated. For example, a three-credit course taught by two faculty members should be assigned as 0.5 course to each faculty member, and a four credit course as 0.67. If a faculty member appointed solely to this department taught a course in another department, such course(s) should be included here.

Line 5: Number of Other Course Units Taught On Load. See table below for the weights that should be used to convert graded instructional experiences that do not follow the traditional course format (e.g., individual studies, supervision of dissertation research, etc.) to course units. If a faculty member appointed solely to this department taught a course unit in another department, such course unit(s) should be included here. Note: any time these weights are used, the resulting units should go into this line (if on load) or into line 11 (if on overload).

Course Level	N of Credits = 1 Course Unit
800-899 (dissertation & doct. level individ. studies)	10 Credits = 1 Course Unit
799 (masters thesis)	13 Credits = 1 Course Unit
500-798 (other graduate level individual studies)	18 Credits = 1 Course Unit
400-499 (graduate/ug level individual studies)	21 Credits = 1 Course Unit
100-399 (undergraduate level individual studies)	30 Credits = 1 Course Unit

Line 6: Total Courses + Course Units Taught. The addition of lines 4 and 5.

Line 7: Number of Student Credit Hours. The total number of student credit hours generated, ON LOAD, by each type of faculty.

Line 8: Number of Lower Division Student Credit Hours. The total number of lower division student credit hours generated, ON LOAD, by each type of faculty.

Line 9: Number of Upper Division Student Credit Hours. The total number of upper division student credit hours generated, ON LOAD, by each type of faculty.

Line 10: Number of Graduate Student Credit Hours. The total number of graduate student credit hours generated, ON LOAD, by each type of faculty.

Line 11: Number of Courses Taught on Overload. The total number of courses and other course units taught on overload (for remuneration above base salary) by each type of faculty. Private instruction (e.g., music) for which a faculty member is paid extra remuneration, and for which the student receives credit, should be reported in this line, using the conversion weights included in the instructions for line 5.

Line 12: Number of Faculty Who Taught Standard Load. Number of faculty members who taught the number of course units specified in line 3.

Note: Part-time core faculty, full-time faculty employed for only one semester, faculty on leave without pay for one semester, and faculty who held a joint appointment in another department or UMS institution, and whose teaching load was proportional to the standard load should be included here. For example, a part-time core faculty employed half-time who taught half the standard load should be included here. Similarly, individuals whose appointments are supported in whole or in part by Agricultural Experiment Station or Cooperative Extension Service's funds, and whose teaching load was proportional to the standard load should also be included here. For example, a faculty member half of whose salary was paid with Cooperative Extension Service funds, and who taught half the standard load should be included here.

Line 13: Number of Faculty Who Taught More than Standard Load. Number of faculty members who taught a number of course units larger than the number specified in line 3.

Line 14: Number of Faculty Exempted from Teaching Standard Load. The number of faculty members who did not teach the course units specified in line 3. (NOTE: LINE 12 + LINE 13 + LINE 14 = LINE 1)

Lines 15 through 23: By Type of Exception (N of Faculty | Total Course Reduction). The faculty members reported in line 14 should be distributed according to the principal reason for their not teaching the course units specified in line 3. When more than one type of exception applies, the one accounting for most of the faculty member's reassigned time should be used. (NOTE: THE ADDITION OF THE NUMBER OF FACULTY IN LINES 15 THROUGH 23 SHOULD EQUAL LINE 14). The total course reduction for each exception category should also be reported. For example, if one tenured professor was released of teaching two courses to develop a new course, and a tenure-track assistant professor was released of teaching one course to teach a course on an off-campus center, the entries in "Instruction-Related" (line 15), under "Tenured & Tenure-Track Faculty," would be 2 | 3 (e.g., two faculty members were released from teaching three courses). The # of course" a faculty member has been exempted from teaching does not necessarily have to add to whole numbers. For example, a faculty expected to teach 8 courses who taught 7 courses and the equivalent of 0.3 course units in individual instruction should be reported as having been exempted from teaching 0.7 courses.

Line 15: Instruction. Exceptions from the standard teaching load based upon instruction-related factors, including class size; development of new courses; modality

of instruction, including distance education; level of instruction; etc.

Line 16: Departmental Administration. Assumption of responsibility for the functions of assistant chair, program director, or for special departmental projects.

Line 17: Externally Funded Research and Service Activities. Assignment of additional time for research or service activities supported by external funds, either research or training grants.

Line 18: Department-Supported Research. (Departmental Research). Assignment of additional time for research activities supported by the department.

Line 19: Department-Supported Service - Profession. Assignment of additional time to serve in areas of service to the profession; e.g., as editor of a large journal.

Line 20: Department-Supported Service - Internal. Assignment of additional time in areas of service to the institution/system to serve in committees, as chair of faculty senate, etc.

Line 21: Department-Supported Service - Public. Assignment of additional time in areas of service to the public: schools, business, government, and non-profit organizations.

Line 22: Sabbatical. Exempted from teaching (either for a semester or for the entire academic year) by reason of being on sabbatical.

Line 23: Illness/Death/Other. If "other", specify for each faculty exemption falling in this category.

Lines 24 through 33: Non-Instructional Productivity. Summary of the non-instructional productivity of the departmental faculty. These data are collected through the Survey of Faculty Non-Instructional Productivity. The non-instructional productivity of faculty members who are not included in the form (e.g., research faculty whose salary is funded wholly from external sources) may be added to the column "Department Total." In each line, the actual productivity (e.g., the number of books) and the "ratio" (defined as the total productivity divided by line 2 - FTEF), are requested. If 94-95 data are not available, 93-94 data should be used.

Line 24: Number of books published, including textbooks and edited works.

Line 25: Number of refereed works (such as journal articles, poems, short stories, etc.) published, including chapters in books.

Line 26: Number of non-refereed works published by commercial and non-commercial organizations, including newspaper articles.

Line 27: Number of creative activities ("non-verbal research") completed or in which the faculty member had a meaningful participation, including artistic (musical, theatrical and dance) performances; art exhibits; recitals; concerts; etc.

Line 28: Number of presentations given to conferences, seminars, etc. sponsored by professional associations.

Line 29: Number of externally funded research and training grants received this year.

Line 30: Number of faculty members in the department who were awarded externally funded research and training grants.

Line 31: Total dollar amount expended this fiscal year from all externally funded research and training grants awarded to faculty members.

Line 32: Number of days spent in public service with public school systems, government agencies, non-profit organizations, and businesses.

Line 33: Number of undergraduate students advised.

Line 34: Number of graduate/professional degree recipients for whom you served as program advisor, or on their master's thesis/dissertation committees.